

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

THIRD APPELLATE DISTRICT

(Sacramento)

----

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

JAMES WOODROW THOMAS,

Defendant and Appellant.

C071055

(Super. Ct. No. 10F05747)

This is an appeal pursuant to *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436 (*Wende*).

On August 27, 2010, defendant James Woodrow Thomas approached Ronald W. who was walking home and demanded money. The victim refused. Defendant punched the victim in the face, causing the victim to fall to the ground. Defendant then stole the victim's wallet and keys.

Defendant had previously been convicted of robbery (1990, Alameda County), first degree burglary (1993, Sacramento County), and criminal threats (2001, Sacramento County).

Defendant entered a plea of no contest to second degree robbery (Pen. Code, § 211) and admitted a strike prior (Pen. Code, §§ 667, subds. (b)-(i), 1170.12) and three prior serious felony convictions (Pen. Code, § 667, subd. (a)) in exchange for a stipulated state prison sentence of 19 years (low term of two years, doubled for the strike prior, plus five years each for the prior felony convictions). The court sentenced defendant accordingly. The court awarded 454 actual days and 68 conduct days for a total of 522 days of presentence custody credit. The court imposed a \$200 restitution fine, a \$200 parole revocation restitution fine, a \$10 crime prevention fine, a \$40 court security fee, and a \$30 court facility fee. At subsequent hearings, the court ordered defendant to pay \$228.69 in victim restitution and amended presentence custody credit to 460 actual days and 69 conduct days for a total of 529 days.

Defendant appeals.

We appointed counsel to represent defendant on appeal. Counsel filed an opening brief that sets forth the facts of the case and requests this court to review the record and determine whether there are any arguable issues on appeal. (*People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436.) Defendant was advised by counsel of the right to file a supplemental brief within 30 days of the date of filing of the opening brief. More than 30 days elapsed, and we received no communication from defendant. Having undertaken an examination of the entire record, we find no arguable error that would result in a disposition more favorable to defendant.

We note clerical errors. The trial court orally ordered defendant to pay a \$30 court facility fee (Gov. Code, § 70373) and \$228.69 in victim restitution but these amounts do not appear on the amended abstract of judgment. We will order the abstract corrected accordingly.

## DISPOSITION

The trial court is directed to prepare a corrected abstract of judgment to reflect the \$30 court facility fee (Gov. Code, § 70373) and \$228.69 in victim restitution and to forward a certified copy of the corrected abstract to the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation. The judgment is affirmed.

\_\_\_\_\_ HULL \_\_\_\_\_, Acting P. J.

We concur:

\_\_\_\_\_ ROBIE \_\_\_\_\_, J.

\_\_\_\_\_ HOCH \_\_\_\_\_, J.